Minutes of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Friday, February 10, 2012
10:00 am
232 English Building

Present: Paul Prior (Chair); Phillip Geil, Faye Lesht, Kristi Kuntz

Not Present: Lucille Rich

Visitors: Nancy Welsh (Admissions); Carol Malmgren (Registrar); Gay Miller (Chair, EPC)

1. **Introductions**

2. **Review of question of residency requirement in minors**

   Prior noted that this subcommittee was formed to address general questions about consideration of residency requirements in minors that arose in connection with EP.12.21 (a proposal to revise the minor in Communication). Questions that arose in the EPC around that proposal focused on how such requirements aligned with transfer credit policies and articulation agreements, if (and how) such requirements can be audited in DARS, what needs such policies might serve and what costs such policies might impose.

3. **Discussion of questions of transfer and articulation agreements in relation to such requirements**

   Review of existing practices (e.g., other residency requirements such as the long-standing requirement for 12 advanced hours in all LAS majors, the GWS requirement for 9 advanced hours in the minor, and the 12 hours of core-course requirements, which includes two 200-level courses and two 300-level courses, in the Business minor for non-Business major) and of language about transfer on the admissions website made it clear a) that such policies have been implemented in several cases on campus and b) that these policies can be implemented in ways that conform to the existing agreements and representations involving transfer.

   Several participants noted that from the perspective of transfer students, and even UIUC students who might want to take coursework at other institutions in the summer, these kinds of residency requirements could be difficult to understand and frustrating. In a context where the University is seeking to increase the number of transfer students, this concern may be particularly sharp.

4. **Discussion of monitoring of such requirements in DARS**

   Carol Malmgren explained how transfer courses and proficiency courses are noted on the student academic transcript and in the degree audit. She noted that DARS is able to implement and audit such requirements in very flexible ways. For example, a course taken at another institution that met a General Education requirement could be recorded as meeting that requirement and the same course (required, for example, to be taken on campus for a minor) could be taken here and accounted for separately as meeting the minor requirement.

(OVER)
5. **Discussion of educational rationale for, and implications of, such requirements**

Discussion of the rationale for and implications of such requirements noted the competing values of recognizing and accepting the work students do at other institutions that has been validated through course articulation at Illinois while also ensuring the integrity and quality of minors offered by departments and programs on campus.

In looking at the examples identified, the subcommittee noted that most involved advanced courses (or specialized and locally unique core sequences, i.e., courses that would not be articulated for transfer) and most involved 50% or less of the overall requirement.

One question raised was whether departments might be facing problems from courses not having been numbered appropriately (e.g., courses that should have been 300-level courses that were given 200-level numbers).

6. **Discussion of subcommittee report and/or recommendations to the full Committee on Educational Policy**

The question was raised of whether the subcommittee should recommend general guidelines to follow in these cases. The sense of the committee was that a general policy might not allow departments to craft requirements to meet legitimate needs and that it would be unusual for EPC to generate new policies on question like this one. However, there was a strong sense in the subcommittee of the importance of ensuring that these policies are well motivated, both to ensure the value of the minor and to respect the interests of students (particularly, but not exclusively, transfer students).

In this light, the subcommittee agreed to recommend 1) careful inquiry by the EPC and dialogue with the department into the specific problems that prompt proposals for such residency requirements and 2) consideration of the other best practices that might ensure the integrity of the minor (e.g., consideration of advanced credit requirements, review of departmental course articulation practices and decisions, analysis of current curricular offerings and structure).

7. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.